REMARKS

Claim Amendments

Claims 100, 105, 136, 138 and 168 are amended herein. Applicant contends that the amendments are supported by the Specification as filed, and thus do not constitute new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 100-102, 104, 136-138 and 168-169 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by "Using Paradox 5 for Windows" QUE, 1994, pp. 181-233. Applicant has amended independent claims 100, 105 and 138 to more clearly define the intended subject matter. Claims 101, 137 and 169 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 100 recites, in part, "wherein the computer software is adapted to cause the computer system to construct the generated file by taking the following actions: establishing in the GUI, responsive to entry of first data into the first set of labeled fields, a first subset and a second subset of the second set of labeled fields, wherein the first subset of the second set of labeled fields is allowed to accept second data and the first subset of the second set of labeled fields contains at least one labeled field, and wherein the second subset of the second set of labeled fields is inhibited from accepting data." Claim 100 further recites, in part, "assigning each field of the second set of labeled fields to one or the other of the first subset and the second subset of the second set of labeled fields, on the basis of which set of criteria, in a predetermined plurality of sets of criteria, is satisfied by the first data entered into the first set of labeled fields."

In reference to claim 100, Applicant thus contends that the first subset and the second subset of the second set of labeled fields are established in response to the entry of the first data, and that each field of the second set of labeled fields is assigned to one or the other of the first subset, i.e., data accepting, and the second subset, i.e., data inhibited, of the second set of labeled fields on the basis of a set of criteria that is satisfied by the first data. *See, e.g.,* Specification, page 28, lines 10-17 ("What changes is that any given insurance company will desire only a particular subset of the total number of fields. So if insurance company A is chosen, then fields 1,2,3,7,9, . . . have to be filled in, whereas, if insurance company B is chosen, then fields 2,3,4,5,7,11, . . . have to be filled in. The fields not needed are automatically signified in some

way by the AIC software, e.g., if insurance company A does not need Field #4 then that block on the screen is gray and can't be typed into (i.e., is 'write protected')."). Applicant contends that the cited reference does not determine which fields are able to accept data and which fields are inhibited from accepting data based on entered data satisfying any criteria. Applicant thus contends that claim 100 is patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claim 105 recites, in part, "wherein the file format for the generated file is selected from a predetermined set of R file formats on the basis of which set of criteria, in a predetermined plurality of sets of criteria, is satisfied by the first data entered into the first set of labeled fields." Applicant thus contends that the comparison of the first data to the sets of criteria determines what file format will be used for the generated file. *See, e.g.,* Specification, page 49, lines 20-23. ("For each insurance company, this application is tailored so that it contains the specific information required by that company and it contains that information in the form required by that company. As such, the necessity to force standard formats on the insurance industry is eliminated."). Applicant contends that the cited reference does not teach or suggest selecting a file format based on entered data satisfying any criteria. Applicant thus contends that claim 105 is patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claim 138 recites, in part, "wherein the computer software is adapted to cause the computer system to construct the generated file by taking the following actions: establishing in the GUI, responsive to entry of first data into the first set of labeled fields, a first subset and a second subset of the second set of labeled fields, wherein the first subset of the second set of labeled fields is allowed to accept second data and the first subset of the second set of labeled fields contains at least one labeled field, and wherein the second subset of the second set of labeled fields is inhibited from accepting data." Claim 138 further recites, in part, "assigning each field of the second set of labeled fields to one or the other of the first subset and the second subset of the second set of labeled fields, on the basis of which set of criteria, in a first predetermined plurality of sets of criteria, is satisfied by the first data entered into the first set of labeled fields." For the same reasoning as provided with respect to claim 100, Applicant contends that the cited reference does not determine which fields are able to accept data and which fields are inhibited from accepting data based on entered data satisfying any criteria. Applicant thus contends that claim 138 is patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claim 138 also recites, in part, "wherein the file format for the generated file is selected from a predetermined set of R file formats on the basis of which set of criteria, in a second predetermined plurality of sets of criteria, is satisfied by the first data entered into the first set of labeled fields." For the same reasoning as provided with respect to claim 105, Applicant contends that the cited reference does not teach or suggest selecting a file format based on entered data satisfying any criteria. Applicant thus contends that claim 138 is patentably distinct from the cited reference on this basis as well.

As claims 102 and 104 include all patentable limitations of claim 100, claim 136 includes all patentable limitations of claim 105, and claim 168 includes all patentable limitations of claim 138, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of claims 100, 102, 104, 136, 138 and 168.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 103, 105-121, 124-135, 139-153 and 156-167

Claims 103, 105-121, 124-135, 139-153 and 156-167 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradox as applied to claim 100 above, and further in view of Kessler, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,077).

Applicant contends that it has shown amended claims 100, 105 and 138 to be patentably distinct from the primary Paradox reference. The secondary reference of Kessler et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference with respect to claims 100, 105 and 138 in that neither reference, alone or in combination, determines what fields can or cannot accept data, or what file format will be chosen for a generated file, on the basis of what criteria are satisfied by entered data.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant contends that claims 100, 105 and 138 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken either alone or in combination. As claim 103 includes all patentable limitations of claim 100, claims 106-121 and 124-135 include all patentable limitations of claim 105, and claims 139-153 and 156-167 include all patentable limitations of claim 138, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claims 103, 105-121, 124-135, 139-153 and 156-167.

Claims 122-123 and 154-155

Claims 122-123 and 154-155 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradox in view of Kessler et al.

Applicant contends that it has shown amended claims 105 and 138 to be patentably distinct from the primary Paradox reference. The secondary reference of Kessler et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference with respect to claims 105 and 138 in that neither reference, alone or in combination, determines what fields can or cannot accept data, or what file format will be chosen for a generated file, on the basis of what criteria are satisfied by entered data.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant contends that claims 105 and 138 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken either alone or in combination. As claims 122-123 include all patentable limitations of claim 105, and claims 154-155 include all patentable limitations of claim 138, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claims 122-123 and 154-155.

Claims 170-182

Applicant notes that each of claims 170-182 is dependent from a base claim believed to be allowable, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as provided for their base claim in the foregoing arguments. As such, Applicant requests allowance of claims 170-182.

CONCLUSION

Claims 100, 105, 136, 138 and 168 are amended herein. Claims 100, 102-136, 138-168 and 170-182 are currently pending.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any further fees deemed necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501373.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2204.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 25 JAN 08

Thomas W. Leffert
Reg. No. 40,697

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T (612) 312-2200
F (612) 312-2250